1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Docket No. 3:10CR431
4	Plaintiffs,) Toledo, Ohio
5	v.) July 3, 2012
6	ANTHONY WILLOUGHGY,) Sentencing
7	Defendants.)
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF EXCERPT OF SENTENCING HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JACK ZOUHARY
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	For the Plaintiffs: James V. Moroney, Jr. Ava Rotell Dustin
14	Office of the U.S. Attorney Four SeaGate, Suite 308
15	Toledo, Ohio 43604 (419) 242-5675
16	(419) 242-3073
17	For the Defendant: Spiros Cocoves
18	610 Adams Street Toledo, Ohio 43604
19	(419) 241-5506
20	Court Deport on: Angelo D. Niver DDD CDD
21	Court Reporter: Angela D. Nixon, RPR, CRR 1716 Spielbusch Avenue
22	Toledo, Ohio 43624 (419) 260-5259
23	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript
24	produced by notereading.
25	

THE COURT: Please be seated everyone. Good morning. I apologize for the delay. We are here on case number 3:10CR431, United States versus Anthony Willoughby.

The defendant is present in court along with his counsel, Spiros Cocoves. On behalf of the government we have Assistant U.S. Attorney Jim Moroney and Ava Dustin.

And we have present at the government table Jack Hardy, right?

AGENT HARDIE: Jake Hardy.

1.3

THE COURT: Thank you, Jake. And is Peter Swartz here? He is in the back, okay. I'll acknowledge him as well. We have from pretrial services and probation Myrna Greenwood.

This sentencing hearing was continued from last week to allow additional filings on behalf of the parties, and I want the record to reflect that I have received, and I thank counsel for their supplemental sentencing memos reflected on the docket as document numbers 118 and 119.

Attached to the defendant's supplemental sentencing memo is a document that was sent to me, and also apparently sent to counsel. It's attached to that memo, and it is the defendant's pro se objections. And I have addressed those objections, and in order that either has been or will be filed. I shared it with all counsel for all sides. It is document number 120. And it is captioned

Order Regarding Defendant's Supplemental Objections. I believe, therefore, that I have addressed all the objections that have been filed in this matter, and there have been numerous, and I have attempted to do a response in writing so that everyone in advance of the hearing would understand where we stood.

Let me continue with some preliminary remarks. A presentence report has been prepared by our probation department, a presentence department (sic). That report is dated January 19 of this year with the revision date of June 22. That report reflects that the defendant is found guilty in a single count of sex trafficking of a minor, and the penalty for that is the minimum of 15 years up to life in prison, a \$250,000 fine and five years to life on supervised release. The defendant has been arrested as of October 6th, 2010 and was detained by Magistrate Judge Armstrong at that time and he has been detained continuously since then.

So for starters, let me confirm with all sides that they've had an opportunity to review the presentence report, including the revisions, they've had an opportunity to advise pretrial services and The Court of objections.

And before counsel, also let me confirm that they've reviewed the report and discussed it with their respective clients, and finally, let me confirm the guideline range in

this case. And we're looking at a total offense level of 40, a criminal history category of six for a guideline range of 360 months to life. And as I've already indicated a statutory mandatory minimum of 15 years to life.

So counsel, please confirm with me those several matters as well as the math that I've just summarized.

MR. MARONEY: Your Honor, on behalf of the United States we have read the report, reviewed it, we have no objections, and we are in agreement with the guideline range as stated by you.

THE COURT: Thank you. Spiros?

MR. COCOVES: Judge, yes, we too have reviewed the report, and, again, we have objections to those findings, and The Court has overruled those. And based on The Court's ruling, that would be the correct guideline range.

THE COURT: Thank you. I'll make a note that the -- well, first let me confirm with you, Mr. Willoughby, that you've have had an opportunity to review the report and revisions, you've had an opportunity to provide The Court with comments and your objections to that report, am I correct.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, I have an issue with that, Your Honor. Last week, last Tuesday, there seems to be a due process violation.

THE COURT: Does that have to do with the report?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes. I don't see how there
was an order issued on objections when I didn't -- when I
received the revised PSR less than 24 hours before
receiving that order, and I was not given the opportunity
to appear and present evidence that supports my objections,
physical evidence, that supports my objections at the
hearing.

THE COURT: I'm trying to follow you. You mean at the last hearing?

THE DEFENDANT: Tuesday, last Tuesday, yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. It was my understanding that given the date of the revision to the report, which was June 22, and the proximity of the hearing that we continued the hearing to allow both sides an opportunity, if they wish, to comment on the revisions of the report. And as I've indicated, I have issued written rulings on those objections, both just prior to the last hearing and just prior to the hearing today. You, it seems to me, had an opportunity based on the attachment to the supplemental sentencing memo, you had an opportunity to review that report again, and you had an opportunity to present The Court your objections and comments on that report. That's filed. It's of record, and my response to it is also filed and of record. So what further evidence, or what else do

you wish to present to The Court with respect to --1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Well, I actually have --3 THE COURT: -- the revised report? I actually have the historical 4 THE DEFENDANT: 5 sentencing guidelines which clearly show that the six point 6 enhancements, the four are impermissible double counting 7 which is in the historic sentencing guidelines of the 2008 Adam Walsh Act that were amended November 1st, 2009. It's 8 clearly in there stated. I clearly have the statute of 9 conviction from my 2005 conviction out of Ohio, which I 10 11 just read the report and it says that that was properly authenticated. But I actually have a copy right here, and 12 13 it has not been authenticated. 14 THE COURT: Well, if you wish to present me with 15 the paper you have on your 2005 conviction, I will share it 16 with Myrna. We'll have a look at it, and we'll see whether 17 or not, in fact, that conviction is improperly recorded in 18 your presentence report. So we can take care of that right 19 now with respect to your objections to the enhancement. 20 The Court understands your arguments, I respectfully 21 disagree with your arguments. I have overruled that 22 objection, and as I've indicated, those enhancements will 23 apply. And I don't know if you have anything new or 24 different in that regard, I'm happy to hear that, but you 25 have had several opportunities to discuss those

enhancements, and you and I will just have to agree to disagree about this.

THE DEFENDANT: I was under the assumption that my attorney is my voice, so my attorney and myself have been just fighting back and forth about this because I'm, like, I want my evidence proffered. If the government can present evidence, so should I. So he tells me, and I quote, well, you're not getting a fair shot at this. This is the government's arena and they pay the refs. So what am I supposed to do when an attorney tells me something like that?

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Willoughby, you've had an opportunity during the course of this entire case to speak, and you've done that, and you've done it well on your behalf. If you have something you wish to share with me today, whatever took place before today, I have no comment on between you and your lawyer. I will note that your lawyer has made filings on your behalf and has given to The Court all the filings that you have prepared on your own behalf. So if you have something in addition that you wish me to consider, if it's appropriate, I will take a look at it. And if it's not appropriate, I'll tell you so.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm getting out the conviction --

```
(Mr. Willoughby and defense counsel having
 1
 2
                    an off-the-record discussion.)
 3
               MR. COCOVES: Your Honor, what he's -- what
 4
     Mr. Willoughby has, Judge --
 5
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, is your mic on, Spiros?
 6
               MR. COCOVES: I'm sorry.
 7
               THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
 8
               MR. COCOVES: What Mr. Willoughby's referring to
 9
     is the judgment entry signed by Judge Charles Wittenberg on
10
     February 25th, 2005. The copy we have comments on it which
11
     I don't think that we would care to share just because for
12
     various reasons.
13
               THE COURT: Personal comments you mean?
14
               MR. COCOVES: Yes.
                                   Yes.
                                         Yes.
15
               THE COURT: Not official comments on the record?
16
               MR. COCOVES: No, no, just comments on the
17
     contents of what -- and then there's also a copy of the
18
     statute in effect at the time, and in addition, materials
19
     from, again, that has handwriting on it. And do you mind
20
     if he sees these?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: No, not at all. I encourage it.
22
     It should be made part of the record.
23
               MR. COCOVES: On behalf of Mr. Willoughby, Judge,
24
     we're asking The Court to accept this as an exhibit.
25
     we'd like to do is exchange those by the close of business
```

today with clean copies. We can fax them over without the 1 2 writing on them. 3 THE COURT: And are you referring to everything 4 that I was just handed or just the Common Pleas Court, 5 Lucas County Judgment Entry? The other matters look to be 6 personal notes of someone, one or the both of you, and I 7 don't know if you want those made part of the record. 8 MR. COCOVES: No, what I'm suggesting is the 9 court refer to the -- refer to it without the handwritten -- we can substitute these, unless there's an 10 objection from the government, with copies that are --11 12 THE COURT: I understand. 13 MR. COCOVES: -- without handwriting on them. 14 think that's clear. 15 THE COURT: So do you want everything submitted 16 or just the judgment entry without the handwritten notes? 17 Obviously you want the clean copy, I assume, of the 18 judgment entry? 19 MR. COCOVES: Correct, yes. 20 Is that right, Mr. Willoughby? THE COURT: 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, the judgment --22 THE COURT: That's not a problem. We can do 23 that. I should indicate that I've been handed the Judgment 24 Entry file stamped February 25, 2005, Common Pleas Court 25 Lucas County. And Judge Wittenberg was The Judge at that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sentencing guideline also.

criminal matter, and it indicates that on February 24, 2005, a sentencing hearing was held, and the defendant was convicted of possession of crack cocaine and trafficking in cocaine. And it cites the respective statutes that those charges violated. And it is, by my quick glance, consistent with paragraph 55 of the presentence report which discusses this case and the sentence in that case. I'm happy to have this document added to the record in this case. Does the government wish to see this judgment entry? You may. But ignore the handwriting, please. And I understand, Mr. Willoughby, that one of your objections which I addressed in document number 120, was that you felt that the conviction referenced in paragraph 155 of the PSR was not authentic or not valid. I would suggest that the document you have just provided The Court, in fact, reinforces that paragraph of the presentence report. THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Anything further that you wish to provide The Court that has not been provided to date? THE DEFENDANT: Well, my -- I'm not clear if I'm entitled to provide it or not, but it's case law. I don't know how that works. The case law that supports, and you have the, I believe Mr. Cocoves passed you a historical

THE COURT: As part of the package that was just 1 2 handed to me? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 4 THE COURT: These are items that you referenced 5 in earlier filings with The Court? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, but I just wanted to 7 actually place the actual -- I don't know -- I don't know, 8 you know. 9 It's not really necessary to place in THE COURT: the record the statutes or the cases. The fact that you 10 11 have cited them and the fact that I have access to them 12 here is sufficient, so it is not necessary that you provide 13 those to The Court or that they be made part of the record. 14 If I was unable to find something I certainly would have let you or your lawyer know that I couldn't find a case or 15 16 citation, but I believe I understood the arguments you've 17 made to date. So it is not necessary to pile on, so to 18 speak, with additional paperwork at this point certainly. 19 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. The criminal damaging 20 statute, we do have in our evidence what that actual 21 offense actually was with the police report. My prior 22 counsel never gave me a copy of that police report, but 23 it's in the attorney's records. And I would request that 24 that be made part of the record to show that that one point

for that criminal damaging doesn't apply for that issue as

25

well for the reason of what the actual offense was.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And again, you've made that argument in your prior filings, and that is referenced in paragraph 49 of our presentence report. And there is a summary there of that situation. Frankly, I believe that single point was appropriately calculated under guideline section 4A 1.1(c). And in any event, that one point wouldn't make a difference, frankly, in the guideline range in this case and the number of points that you have been assigned. I'm not sure it takes you anywhere, in other words, if the argument takes you anywhere because a criminal history category four is made up of those with points of seven, eight or nine. You had eight points. Even if we took away one point you'd still be in that same critical history four which perhaps is a moot issue which with the career offender you're up to a six. Even if the career offender didn't apply, you'd still be a four. And your objection has been noted, and, again, even though I've overruled it, it is part of record in this case and is available for review on appeal.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. So what about the issue of me not being able to appear at that hearing?

THE COURT: Appear at what hearing?

THE DEFENDANT: That's what I'm saying. I don't know -- I don't know what happened. I don't know how an

order was issued on objections when I didn't have a chance to review the revised PSR. That's what I'm saying. I don't know what happened.

THE COURT: Now I've lost you.

MR. COCOVES: What Mr. Willoughby's saying,

Judge, is that the revised presentence report was issued on
the Friday before the Tuesday hearing.

THE COURT: Correct.

MR. COCOVES: And The Court made its rulings based on, in part at least, on that revised PSR, which we did not have a chance to review before the -- we didn't have a chance to comment on those to The Court prior to The Court making its ruling on those objections.

what I ruled on were the objections that were filed by the defendant prior to that hearing on the original presentence report. And I issued my order taking into account those arguments. Some of the revisions were made by pretrial services, probation, presentence, some were not, some of your objections were sustained. Some were not. And I incorporated all of that in my last order. And since then you have had the opportunity to review that presentence report with whatever changes were or were not made based on your objections and my rulings and have had an opportunity and had an opportunity today, as well as by the extensive

filing attached to your supplemental sentencing memo, to 1 2 again renew some of those objections and make other 3 objections that you chose fit to make. So I'm not 4 understanding how you haven't had an opportunity to be 5 heard both orally here today and in writing extensively 6 both prior to the last hearing as well as prior to this 7 hearing today. THE DEFENDANT: Well, I agree that you just did 8 9 take care of that issue for me just now. 10 THE COURT: Okay. THE DEFENDANT: 11 I agree with you on that. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. 13 THE DEFENDANT: One other issue that I have that 14 I would just like clarification on because I don't know is 15 from my understanding the PSR is to -- is to contain facts 16 from the trial and not allegations from the agent from his 17 FD-302s that are unsworn. And my objection has been the 18 whole time with the PSR is the majority of all of those 19 paragraphs in the PSR is not what Shenae Wells testified to 20 at trial, but is, rather, what one of the agents stated in 21 his unsworn FD-302s. So my concern is it seems like 22 they're trying to wash away the very noodly trial testimony 23 and replace it with that of the agent's story and unsworn 24 FD-302s.

THE COURT: Let me indicate that the presentence

25

report is allowed to contain statements from FBI agents, just as it is allowed to contain statements and does contain statements from you that are unsworn. And I will indicate here now, as I have in the supplemental order which was filed this morning, that I am well aware of the trial testimony in this case. I was present during the trial, and I've re-read the trial transcript. And most of the so-called differences that you made note of in your writing and here again between the FBI interviews and the trial testimony are minor or immaterial in my view. And I will further note that none of them affect the guideline calculation in this case.

Further, I will assure you, Mr. Willoughby, that my sentence in this case is going to be based on the sworn testimony at the trial, and any other sworn testimony that may come in and your writings that you have submitted to The Court will preserve any error that you believe flows from matters in the presentence report that might differ between the FBI interview statements and the testimony at trial.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Sure. Let me hear from the government. Do you have anything to add on that point by the way --

MR. MARONEY: Your Honor, the statute provides

that there's no limit on the information that can be 1 2 supplied to The Court in terms of sentencing. We are 3 entitled to provide to the probation officer the offense 4 conduct through whatever materials we want, and those 5 include 302s and witness statements, so again, we agree 6 with what you just said, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Any other preliminary matters, 8 Mr. Willoughby? THE DEFENDANT: 9 Yeah. What Mr. Moroney said would that mean that I would also have the right to 10 11 introduce 302 statements as well? THE COURT: You have 302 statements? 12 13 THE DEFENDANT: From the witnesses who testified 14 at trial that are completely contradictory to -- you 15 understand what I'm saying? 16 THE COURT: I do. And again, I will say that the 17 presentence report tries to provide The Judge with a 18 complete picture of the defendant who is appearing in the 19 case, and as you know, it goes into some detail and goes 20 fairly far back and covers family matters, educational 21 matters, employment matters, certainly matters that were 22 not discussed at the trial of this case. So there are matters that are set forth in here. You have had the 23 24 opportunity and have, in fact, indicated your objections to

those parts of the report that you disagree, and that's

25

fine, and that's all in the record. You've had an opportunity to talk with the writer of this report and give her your version of the facts. That's in here as well.

And so both sides have had an opportunity to provide me with what they believe are important facts for me to know prior to the sentence. And you have clearly indicated to me that you disagree with a number of the facts set forth in the report and a number of the conclusions. And the record contains that. It's there. And I'm not sure how much further we need to beat that horse.

I don't know if you have anything new to offer that you haven't yet offered The Court either through your counsel, through a hearing, in writing. If you have something new that you believe has not been disclosed to date, let's hear it or let's see it. But if it's something we've already covered at least once before, I'm going to suggest we move on.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. What about the FD-302 from Shenae Wells when she recanted this story June 16, 2009 and the 2008 false accusation on the gentleman -- I think those are very important as far as sentencing goes because that, you know, these are things that was not presented to the trial, just as the government introduced FD-302s of things that were not introduced at trial that I should have had the right to introduce in the PSR like, hey, you know,

okay, the jury found me guilty, but these are factors that the jury was not made aware of because of whatever reason. That should have a major part to play with, you know, the fact that she did recant at one time and the fact that she did make a false accusation before and, you know, can I introduce that? That's what I have been asking my attorney.

THE COURT: Well, my short answer is the trial is past, but Mr. Moroney is standing up and I think ready to address -
MR. MARONEY: Your Honor, I just want to be sure that the record is clear. We've had this discussion with

MR. MARONEY: Your Honor, I just want to be sure that the record is clear. We've had this discussion with counsel. Shenae Wells did not recant in the June 16th note. It's been explained to this defendant.

THE DEFENDANT: He's not being truthful.

THE COURT: Just a moment. I give you the courtesy of speaking. We're going to give everyone the courtesy of speaking without interrupting, please.

THE DEFENDANT: I apologize.

MR. MARONEY: He's been told this and he keeps coming back to it and coming back to it. What Ms. Wells was talking about was information she gave to the agents about where she was immediately prior to June 16, and she says that that information that has been provided was not correct. In no way, shape or form did Shenae Wells -- was

she referring to the whole story about what this defendant did to her up to March 19 of 2009. So we keep hearing this and hearing this, and I just want to be sure that the record is clear of that, that that is not any kind of a recantation that affects the trial of this case.

THE COURT: So we have now made record of this disagreement between both sides, and Mr. Willoughby, it's being recorded by our court reporter to date. It will be part of the hearing transcript for today, and at this juncture we'll let it stand as it is. You two disagree, and it is what it is, and the trial has been concluded. And these are frankly matters that are more appropriate not for sentencing but for appeal.

MS. DUSTIN: Just one note, Your Honor, about the 2008 allegation the defendant referred to, the prior alleged allegation of a rape. We discussed that with trial counsel in chambers, and any information related to that allegation was placed under a sealed document, I believe, so it is still part of the record.

THE DEFENDANT: I was unaware of that. This is new to me.

THE COURT: So again, it appears that what you are trying to introduce is a matter and I now do recall that there was a sealed record during the trial of a discussion of that situation. That document, by the way,

if you wish to have that document, Mr. Willoughby, if you wish, and I would only suggest that you discuss this with your counsel. I can lift any protective order with respect to that document or unseal it for you if you wish to have that document, but that's something you can raise later after you've had a full opportunity to talk to your lawyer about that. And I don't know what you and your lawyer obviously discussed about it or what was shared with you at that time.

THE DEFENDANT: I would like that, Your Honor.

MR. MARONEY: Your Honor, we would appreciate being heard on that because there were reasons for the sealing, and of course the whole matter was stricken on our Rule 412 motion. We would oppose the defendant having that document.

THE COURT: We'll save that for a later date. We can have a discussion about that later. I assume on appeal that may be a matter that may come up, and that would be an appropriate time to discuss that. Again, I don't see that as being pertinent to today's hearing in the sentencing.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I didn't know. I thought that would go into, well, before I give this guy 3,000 years let me take into consideration that things aren't exactly the way they seem because of certain issues, and that was my position on that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Anything else you wish to raise?

THE DEFENDANT: I just want clarity on in the PSR the statements that I read from the order that you provided say "immaterial." Does that mean you're explicitly saying you're not relying on those for sentencing?

THE COURT: I'm saying that some of the differences that you raise really don't amount to much. They aren't significant. They are not determinative of the outcome of my sentence. Whether someone stayed at someone's house two days or three days or the like, I understand that there can be differences in recollections over time of matters, I certainly understand that. I am focused on those matters which are important for the difficult task of determining what is an appropriate sentence in this case. And certainly I have come to learn that minor differences by people recollections may differ over time of certain matters. But there are certain matters that are undisputed, and there are certain matters that come to me already completed, for example, the trial and the verdict. That is what it is, and I have that before me. And as I indicated earlier, I sat through the trial and listened to the testimony along with the jury. So I understand those things. So when I say "immaterial," I mean that the matters that you've pointed out really don't make a difference on what is an appropriate sentence

in this case. 1 THE DEFENDANT: So is there any way that they can 2 3 be taken out of the PSR if they're immaterial? 4 THE COURT: Well, you believe they're immaterial. 5 THE DEFENDANT: You stated they were. 6 THE COURT: I'm saying that the differences that 7 you are highlighting for me in your written filings are 8 immaterial. What I'm going to have happen in this case is, 9 and I'm going to get there I hope in a few minutes, is the 10 presentence report will be made part of the record in this 11 case, including the revisions and including your objections 12 and including my ruling on your objections. So those 13 documents that I filed will be made part of the package for 14 the presentence report in this case. So your voice will 15 continue to be heard on appeal. 16 THE DEFENDANT: And that will be what goes to the 17 BOP? 18 I hope so, yes, along with the other THE COURT: 19 appropriate papers in the package. 20 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 21 THE COURT: Anything further you want to address 22 at this juncture? 23 THE DEFENDANT: I -- I mean, with the statements 24 that Mr. Cocoves made to me as far as, you know, I'm not 25 getting a fair shot, this is the government's arena and

they pay the refs, it just, it -- it just doesn't seem as though I'm going to get a thorough argument out of him and full attention as an advocate for me with him making a statement like that. I mean, it -- the plain English definition of that is there's been some pay off going on or something here.

MR. COCOVES: Can I address this, Judge?

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. COCOVES: This part about wider discussion, and essentially, and I'm stepping aside from Mr. Willoughby's case but just in general, I think that there's been a hysteria surrounding these cases. I'm not suggesting that they are not legitimate offenses and that the laws are unjust, but some of the sentences associated with these kind of cases as well as pornography cases are overreactive and unduly punitive, and this is across the board. I'm not suggesting that anybody's been paid off, but I do feel they are unduly punitive, and society has been asking for these sentences and they're getting them.

And I think in many instances, and I think

Mr. Willoughby is an example, 30 years for this kind of

conduct in this case dwarfs a sentence that if I had shot

somebody in the street here I would be getting a much

lesser sentence, and I think that is a more heinous crime,

killing someone.

I'm not trying to minimize the trauma that the government in the presentence report suggests the victim suffered in this case but she's still alive. And for someone to receive a 15 year sentence for shooting someone in the street whereas somebody like Mr. Willoughby is looking at 30 years to life for conduct that falls short of that kind of result, I find it be unfair, and I've made that known throughout pleadings and in briefs to the various courts. And they have been -- not been followed.

And nobody's -- there's been some general comments, and I think that Judge Merit (phonetic) in particular of the Sixth Circuit has found some sympathy with those arguments, but not the entire Sixth Circuit and certainly not the panels I've appeared in front of. So I -- when I make comments to Mr. Willoughby, I think this is the message I was trying to convey, and I didn't -- I stand behind that message. And I guess I'm jumping into allocation and I'll step back for a moment.

THE COURT: I think both of you have jumped ahead and so I've got a review of upcoming attractions, and that's fine. I need to cake care of first things first. But let me assure both of you at this juncture that my sentence in this case is not in any way, shape or form going to be affected by what you may call hysteria, what you may call publicity, what you may call punitive

1.3

sentences. I have my guidelines to follow, and I'm going to talk about those at the appropriate time in this hearing and what those guidelines are and how I see them applying to this case. That will be my guiding light. And I can assure both of you and anyone else in the courtroom that that's what will drive the sentence in this case and not anything else, not any speculation and certainly not any factors that are inappropriate for me to consider.

MR. COCOVES: And if I may, I understand The Court has -- has to do what The Court has to do based on the laws of the court -- The Court works with, these are just my comments in general, and again, as part of a wider discussion.

THE COURT: I understand. And I understand that wider discussion, but that wider discussion is not before me today, and it's not something I'm going to take into account for your sentence, Mr. Willoughby.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, Your Honor, Mr. Cocoves just concreted what I -- what's been going on between he and I. I mean, I just -- I don't have any confidence with him conducting my sentencing at all. I mean, you know, I don't know -- I don't know how much more I can be clear that once someone tells you something like that, how can I continue with him as counsel?

THE COURT: Well, he just explained the context

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of his comment to you, so it is me who does not understand how you could make the statement you just made. Let me indicate to you, from my observation post I see that your counsel has submitted your arguments to me for review; he has submitted the arguments that he believes ought to be made on your behalf. So I have before me both his insights into your case as well as your own insights into your case. I've addressed and certainly tried to address all of those arguments. I know that you've had conversations, I know that you have talked, and the fact that you are talking is a good thing. You've been talking here in this courtroom together. You've been sharing papers together. I certainly don't see a situation here that calls for, if that's what you're hinting at, a substitution of counsel. It's my observation over these number of weeks that your counsel has made every effort to put before The Court those arguments which he believes are appropriate as well as those arguments that you wish him to make on your behalf. And I think the record will speak for itself in that regard.

Let me indicate that at this point, having had confirmation from counsel for all sides as well as the defendant, Mr. Willoughby, that that presentence report and revisions have been reviewed with opportunities for comment and objection, that the presentence report will be made

part of the record in this case under seal and available as necessary, and we will also supply with that presentence report the objections filed by the defendant, along with this court's rulings on those objections, and that package will be provided both to the BOP as well as available for appeal purposes. I have confirmed the sentencing guideline in this case. I have confirmed the mandatory minimum, and unless counsel for either side have additional testimony for The Court or additional paperwork for The Court, I have not received any letters on behalf of the defendant. I should note that. I'm happy at this point to turn the floor over to defense counsel to argue for an appropriate sentence on his client's behalf.

But before you do, I do have an open remark. I want to address this because it also was something you brought up yet again today, Mr. Willoughby. The last time we met you expressed some dissatisfaction with your classification as a career offender. I want you to know that The Court has carefully reconsidered that classification, and I stand by my earlier ruling that such a classification is appropriate in this case. And it is also set forth in the order I filed today in greater detail. But for now let me say the requirements are set forth in section 4D1.1, which allows for classification as a career offender if, one, you were at least 18 years old

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

at the time you committed the crime in this case; two, the crime is a crime of violence; and three, you had at least two prior felony convictions of controlled substance. is drugs. There is no dispute you meet the first and third of these requirements. While the determination of whether the instant crime is whether one of violence is a bit trickier. It is not as simple as whether you used force or violence, which by the way, the evidence shows that you did. Sex trafficking of children is not one of the enumerated crimes in quideline Section 4B1.2(a). Yet this court is convinced that convictions under the sex trafficking statute necessarily involve conduct that presents a serious potential risk of physical injury to others, namely child victims. As such, this court finds that you are appropriate for consideration under the career offender statute.

As I've indicated in the order filed today, this classification, however, is not a controlling factor in your sentence. Section 3553(a) and the factors under that statute are the appropriate focus. And in that regard, and before counsel for either side speak, I want to now take the opportunity to review the key trial testimony.

I want to note at the outset that we do have the transcript of Shenae's testimony, does not begin to reflect how powerful her testimony was. She was an outstanding

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

witness who did not flinch from questions and who maintained her composure despite the difficult questions and despite the proximity with which you were seated to her as you are today to that witness stand and your constant glare during the entirety of her testimony. She gave straight forward and honest answers to all questions. There's no doubt in my mind, as well as the jurors', that she was telling the truth. And what did she say? She said she was forced to have sex with you. She talked about the anal beads that you forced her to use; that you required her to have sex with others and you indicated she would, quote, learn the game, end quote; that you were her, quote, daddy, end quote; you gave her a list of names from a journal which had Barbie stickers on the cover, and those names of customers with phone numbers were located in a wooden box; you told her what to say to these customers. You gave her names such as Jessica and Jasmine; you gave her your cell phone to call these customers; you were present when she made these calls; you gave her written instructions and directions; you told her what to charge these customers; you provided her clothing to wear, make up and condoms; you advised her not to kiss on the mouth with these customers, that kissing on the mouth was reserved for you; you drove her to appointments, you took the money she collected. Some prostitution took place at your own home

where your own daughter also resided; you attempted to attend and use her at a swingers convention; you told her to walk Lagrange Street, also discussed taking her to Detroit for a week or to Florida to a cat house; you beat her, you hit her for not obeying your rules and for trying to get away. This, in short, was a scared juvenile who had no place to go when she walked into your life, and you made sure she had no place to go during the tortured month that she lived with you.

Coupled with the testimony of Ed and Chip to whom you sent her to have sex and Jill and Renee for whom you also pimped. We have a picture of your world of sex trafficking of minors. Today we have confirmed the guidelines and the statutory minimum.

I now ask counsel to assist me by identifying what reasons they believe support a variance downward from the guideline range as has been suggested by defense counsel or support a sentence greater than the mandatory minimum as suggested by the government. I have, again, for the record, reviewed the supplemental sentencing memos filed by both sides. And thank you for those. If you have further arguments or wish to comment on the opposing brief, I am happy to listen. The floor is yours, Spiros.

MR. COCOVES: Thank you, Judge. My earlier comments I'd ask The Court to consider, proportionate not

2.2

only to the similarly situated defendants but also to other crimes and punishment for those other crimes.

Again, The Court noted that we filed objections to the presentence report as well as the sentencing memorandum and the supplement that contains a great deal of our information and that we'd like The Court to consider.

Just a couple of extra thoughts on my part, first, the presentence report at paragraph 125, the revised version notes that a variance might be appropriate here so there's more than just us, I guess, for lack of a better phrase, making that argument. I also think that at least as of the most recent revised report we had not had an impact statement from the alleged -- from the victim in this case. I don't know, has that changed?

PROBATION: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Myrna indicates that we have no statement from the victim.

MR. COCOVES: Which I would suggest The Court should consider as a factor. I would ask The Court to vary based on the reasons that we offered, and I would also ask for a couple of reasons the -- to the extent The Court relies on the career offender I think in the sentencing memo and the objections, I think it adequately shows that this was basically a dart board -- dart board picked by the commission. There's no statistical backing for that. To

2.2

the extent The Court relies on it I ask The Court to consider that analysis we offered. We did suggest there were three other sentences, I understand. At least I understand based on my own experience that there are probably other factors at play that The Court -- that those sentences were arrived at, but the fact of the matter is average of 105 months for similar violations. And I would ask that The Court consider the factors that we outlined in the sentencing memorandum.

Finally, as regard to whether or not 18 U.S.C.

1591 a crime of violence, The Court acknowledges it is a close question. Intuitively I can see how you might want to come to that conclusion based on other statutes; however, I think intuitively we would think a felon carrying a firearm would be a crime of violence given the potential for harm, yet that is not a crime of violence.

So I believe that question is wide open. And to the extent The Court may want to wish to reflect a variance in that ambiguity in that statute.

Again, I would ask The Court to rely on what we've already submitted, and I believe Mr. Willoughby does have some comments for The Court.

THE COURT: Mr. Willoughby, the floor is yours.

THE DEFENDANT: People of The Court, Your Honor, supporters, thank you. I've been publicly beaten for

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

three-and-a-half years with the equivalence of the late Rodney King. I finally get to speak. I definitely wanted to testify in my own defense, however, trial counsel argued against it and for his reasons he -- I didn't. I realize that was the worst advice that I could have ever been given was to not defend myself. All I have on my record is two drug convictions, so I couldn't understand when he repeatedly told me that they're -- that prosecution is going to kill me with my criminal record of two felony convictions. In hindsight I quess now I see why he chose for me not to testify. This was a Jim Crow investigation, prosecution and trial. This was the kind of trial that was held before there was civil rights, a black man accused of a heinous crime against a white girl who lied about her age and identity, had jungle fever and was scared to get locked up until she was 21 for running away again after she had been given chance after chance. This was her last shot.

Instead of taking responsibility for her own actions the blame was shifted, with the encouragement of the Federal Task Force of Northwest Ohio Violent Crimes Against Children. I had an all white jury from rural Ohio, not one urban white person, not one black person. There was heavy emphasis on my family relation who had nothing to do with me and nothing to do with this case at all.

The jury was never explained to what it meant

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

when Shenae testified to not saying anything about this until the FBI interviewed her, not knowing the FBI was coming and just popping up and asking her if they can talk to her, being interviewed six different times and the first time being with the victim witness specialist present; staying on the run until she was 18 years old, scared to get in trouble for running away again. These were all things that Ms. Wise testified to. The jury -- it wasn't explained to the jury what this all meant, though.

Ladies and gentlemen, this meant coercion. Ms. Wise testified that they interviewed S.W., Shenae, for hours in private. And I say Ms. Wise, I mean Ms. Mary Wise, Shenae's foster mom testified that they interviewed Shenae for hours in private without her guardian present, never given explicit permission to interview Shenae. Shenae trying to kill herself many times before she even ran away on January 19th before she even came in contact These are things that Ms. Wise testified to, the with me. jury was never explained what it meant that Shenae allegedly picked out a photo of Ed at the second chance non-profit organization. The jury was never explained to what the paper clip mark that suggested suggestion on the photo of Ed in the sixth person line up signaled. The jury was never explained that Shenae had recanted this story in June, 2009 and said she had already told the story once and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

figured she'd tell it again. Why change it? Because she didn't want to get in any more trouble. The jury was never explained to that Shenae had a history of recanting after making sexual allegations against a dope man specifically in a 2008 allegation where the gentleman passed the polygraph and Shenae later recanted.

Your Honor, I shouldn't be sentenced because this was not justice guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. was gorilla justice by barbarians, and I didn't have any legitimate counsel for trial. He didn't produce any of my witnesses, didn't challenge any of the government's evidence, didn't effectively cross examine the government's witness, didn't present any evidence in my possession that showed the witnesses were lying, allowed the admission of forbidden character evidence, allowed hearsay vouching and bolstering, allowed improper jury instructions, allowed an amended indictment at the conclusion of trial, did no investigation into my accounts of what happened, didn't gather exculpatory Brinks/Brady material, didn't investigate any of the government's witnesses background, especially the alleged victim for possible motive to fabricate a story, argued against me testifying. The key witness had severe credibility issues, but the government made sure to keep all of those issues out. My attorney, my trial attorney told me in his own words that he could not

effectively cross examine Shenae because the jury would hate him. Those were his words. During a side bar he says he's been known to screw up. Those were his words. He even admitted during that same side bar to instructing the government on how to get suppressed evidence into trial. He allowed 100 percent leading questions on the direct examination. Shenae Wells didn't testify to anything. She said yes, no to everything that the interviewer said to her. He led her with everything.

Your Honor, there was a trial in this courtroom where I was prohibited and restrained by my own counsel to put up a defense. Your Honor, I shouldn't be sentenced because there was a team of rogue prosecutors and rogue federal task force that built a case of alleged force, threats of force, fraud and coercion against me utilizing those very same methods to obtain false accusations from those witnesses against me.

Your Honor, I shouldn't be sentenced because the federal task force that initiated this charge admitted during trial to performing in concert and their significance in getting the job done with the passing of Senate Bill 235 and being in cahoots with the Last Chance Non-profit Organization where the alleged victim was being interviewed at. My indictment came down after 18 months at the exact same time as the resurgence of Senate Bill 235.

That's an obscene level of bias and prejudice and it's not a coincidence.

Your Honor, I shouldn't be sentenced because of the government's obscene level of reliance on my family relation to obtain an indictment during a September 28th grand jury proceeding, during trial when my brother had absolutely nothing to do with this situation. Your Honor, I shouldn't be sentenced because the government withheld key and crucial evidence that went to the heart of this case, withheld key evidence from me, was aware that their witnesses were lying and did nothing to correct their purgered testimony.

The prosecution, especially Mr. Moroney, tampered with evidence before there was probable cause for an arrest warrant during a September 28th, 2010 grand jury hearing with Mr. Hardy. Mr. Hardy was asked by a member of the jury -- grand jury why did it take so long for this indictment. And instead of Mr. Hardy being given the opportunity to answer, Mr. Moroney interfered and said I'll take care of that. This was before there was any probable cause to even arrest me. The U.S. attorney, Mr. Moroney lied to federal magistrates, lied to you, Your Honor. The prosecutors even helped cover up the Federal Task Force illegal and coercive tactics and maneuvering. Even during trial with the witness Stephanie Hummer when she admitted

to my attorney that the Federal Task Force agents had forced her to testify to the grand jury on June 3rd, 2009. This happens to be one of the lies that Mr. Moroney has unfortunately told in this case. Mr. Moroney has said on numerous occasions, and specifically in a Franks hearing motion that a government investigation was not authorized until November 3rd, 2009. However, there is a grand jury proceeding with Ms. Stephanie Hummer on June 3rd, 2009 and a federal grand jury proceeding with Shenae Wells and an interview at the U.S. Attorney's Office, with Mr. Hardy on July 1st, 2009. So it was clear federal involvement before November 3rd, 2009. For some reason Mr. Moroney has chose to say that there's been no federal investigation until November 3rd.

Your Honor, I shouldn't be sentenced because the key component in this case, Federal Agent James Hardy, sat at the prosecution's table during the entire trial given Olympic sized weight to his testimony and credibility to the jury when he testified as a fact finder, an expert witness and evidence gatherer in a case that he investigated that hinged specifically on credibility. He sat right at that table the whole time. There was no way the jury was not going to believe anything he had to say being part of the team at the table.

Your Honor, I shouldn't be sentenced because my

Constitutional rights has been seriously violated when, among other issues, I did not receive my fundamentally fair trial or effective assistance of counsel. Ms. Stephanie Hummer did not testify in this case because she said she was going to refuse. The government was going to impeach her with her grand jury testimony. She requested to speak to my then trial counsel and told him the Federal Task Force forced her to testify against me at the grand jury on June 3rd, 2009 and was attempting to force her to testify during trial. Ms. Stephanie Hummer never testified at trial. She was excused. I argued with my trial counsel that was a perfect example for us because my theory was Shenae was coerced to tell this ridiculous story. He said that Your Honor would not allow Ms. Stephanie Hummer to testify to that.

I shouldn't be sentenced because I'm actually innocent, not guilty. Your Honor, I'm facing prison when I was deprived of the effective ability to develop in evidence the plan or scheme purportedly motivating my accuser, whose state of mind was an essential element of my defense of her fabricating. And I have a Sixth Amendment right to fully and effectively confront that complainant. With all due respect, Your Honor, I should not be sentenced. That's all I have to say.

THE COURT: Thank you. Let's now hear from the

government.

2.2

MR. MARONEY: Your Honor, we've --

THE COURT: And in your remarks, I'd like to hear you comment on the following arguments made by defense counsel, and that is that there was no victim statement in this case and what that may mean for sentencing purposes, that's number one.

Number two, that compared to other crimes, the guidelines are -- this is my phrase, out of whack, I think is what counsel was trying to sense.

MR. COCOVES: Draconian.

THE COURT: Draconian. Thank you. Number three, if you want to comment on whether a violation of statute in this case does indeed constitute a crime of violence.

Number four, similarly situated defendants. In defendant's sentencing memo he highlighted a few cases to suggest that the guideline range is Draconian in comparison to these other similarly situated defendants. And I should, for the record, note and will make it part of the record in this case, that at my request pretrial services prepared a similar comparison of these and other cases to assist The Court. And I think those are the main points that were raised in argument by defense counsel.

I suppose an overall question is, which really encompasses all the points that Spiros made, is how does

one arrive at the guideline range in this case? What is it that drives a sentence in the guideline range for this particular case? He mentioned the way in which the guidelines were conceived for crimes like this. So if you could incorporate in whatever other remarks you have some responses with that, they would be appreciated.

MR. MARONEY: Thank you, Your Honor. First of all, I would note that we filed two sentencing memoranda, and our position remains very strongly that this case calls for a guideline sentence. And that guideline range -- that guideline range is, as The Court is aware and has found, is 360 months to life. As you summarized the testimony of Shenae Wells, we -- that capsulizes the horror to which this 16 year old at the time was subjected.

We stand by the verdict. This verdict speaks very loudly. Needless to say literally everything that The Court just heard from this defendant is not true, incorrect, fabrications, stretching, right down the line, and there's no need to go through that. The victim did provide a statement. She testified. She has not provided a statement to probation. That's her choice. She's had several difficult circumstances since the trial, delivering the baby and her mother passed away. And needless to say because we dealt with her, this has been a tremendously traumatic experience. And the fact that, you know, we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

really can't sit here and speculate as to why she wouldn't want to provide a statement, but her testimony at trial was all the statement she needed to give. And we do not feel in any fashion that that's an appropriate consideration for some factor into sentence, Your Honor.

As far as the guidelines go, they reflect Congress' view and the Sentencing Commission's view as to how horrific these crimes are. There's often discussion about the severe sentences for child exploitation and child porn wherein many cases there isn't a live victim. There's a live victim. There's reasons why Congress has reflected and the Sentencing Commission, under the guidance of Congress, why they have -- have reflected this kind of a treatment. I mean, 15 year mandatory minimum where force fraud and coercion is used or the victim is under 14 up to a life sentence is a direct reflection of Congress' view that this is modern day slavery. Trafficking is a horrific crime. There are many other provisions in the criminal code that reflect Congress' view as to how serious this is. Another one is the presumption in favor of pretrial detention for 1591 offenses. The provisions for social services and restitution, victim care, all of those provisions are meant to reflect that Congress views this as an extremely serious horrific crime. And they have raised, when you look at the provisions in the law, 1591(C) is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

another example where Congress has gone from requiring actual knowledge on the part of the defendant to the age of the victim to reckless disregard. And today, since 2008, it is mere reasonable opportunity to observe. Again, a reflection of how serious they take this. You deal with your victim at your peril. And in this case it's only a guideline sentence within the correctly determined range that would appropriately address the conduct of this defendant.

We have written and asked The Court to find that Section 1591 is a crime of violence. It is not conceivable to us how committing a crime of juvenile sex trafficking affected through means of force, fraud or coercion would not be a crime of violence. And even before the cases that court has noted in its latest filing, many of the offenses that have been determined to be crimes of violence such as escape, indicate the broad view that the guidelines in 4(b)1.2, apply to determining a crime of violence. Certainly the 2423(a) cases, the juvenile man act cases which don't involve force, fraud or coercion, and it's the mere transportation of a juvenile across state lines to engage in prostitution, those have been -- that offense is a crime of violence. So it would be very difficult to fathom how those would be crimes of violence under the career offender provision, but a juvenile sex trafficking

through force, fraud and coercion would not be.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Defense counsel has pointed out some alleged comparable case, 1591 cases in the district. addressed those somewhat, Your Honor. I would note that all of these crimes are -- are, as we've put, horrific. two of the cases cited by defense counsel, the Fetter case with the recent sentence by Judge Katz and the Davis case which was a sentence by Judge Dowd in Akron, you know, I would note that not only were three levels accorded for acceptance of responsibility, but there were downward departures for substantial assistance in those cases. Those defendants acknowledge their wrong doing, they expressed remorse. They provided helpful information to law enforcement which reflected a lower sentence. Touchstone case, again, as I said, these are all horrible Touchstone got ahold of a 16 year old and drove her cases. to a Starbucks in down town Cleveland and sold her for \$300 to what he thought was a madam. In fact, the madam was cooperating with the FBI. The 16 year old was never in any She was immediately recovered by the agents as she left the Starbucks with -- with the purported madam. there was no sex between Touchstone and the victim in that case, no relationship whatsoever. And there was no force, fraud or coercion in that case. And even in the face of those facts The Court sentenced at 15 months above the 120

month mandatory minimum. Again, at the high end of the guideline range.

We've cited additional cases in our memorandum, Your Honor, from other districts where there have been significant sentences of the statutory maximum, 600 months. The one case, I believe Sanchez, with a 240 month sentence cited cases from that district and/or that circuit and other circuits with 25, 30, 35 year sentences for these cases. So in our view, the keys here are to deter future criminal conduct and to protect the public, and especially juveniles. And those purposes are accomplished only with a significant and severe sentence. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'll give you the last word Spiros or Mr. Willoughby.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I'd like to finish something, Your Honor. The Court, supporters, during this ordeal, I lost my home, I didn't get to see my son graduate -- go ahead.

MR. COCOVES: Just a couple comments, Judge. The statute provides for a minimum mandatory of 15. I suggest that's Congress' idea what a sentence should be in these circumstances. I also think that Mr. Moroney spoke about the three -- three sentences that we had included in our sentencing memoranda and that there were factors affecting those sentences. There are factors affecting this sentence

2.2

as well and we've explained those out that would support a downward variance so while there were factors in those, and there are factors here as well. So we would ask The Court to consider that -- a sentence at that 15 year would be more than adequate to meet all the goals of 3553(a).

is guided by the 2005 U.S. Supreme Court decision in Booker, and later cases by that court. I'm also guided by our own appellate court in decisions which it has handed down. And all of these cases require me to consider the applicable guideline range which we have discussed and confirmed. That range is 360 to life with a mandatory minimum of 15 years. This is an advisory benchmark that is the guideline range is -- the mandatory minimum is a dictate from congress that really sets the threshold for the sentence in this case, Mr. Willoughby.

I'm also required to make an individualized assessment of you based on the facts presented in this case to arrive at an appropriate sentence, and that's a process that necessarily involves an exercise in judgment, not just adding up numbers. And oftentimes it involves competing considerations. I look to Section 3553(a), the statute that requires that my sentence be sufficient but not greater than necessary, consider your case, balance the factors under that statute to arrive at a just punishment.

So I will do now what I always do and that is I will address each of those factors and how I see them applying to you and your case.

First, the nature of the crime. I won't go into great detail other than to note from the presentence report, and first let me note as a preliminary matter, which I usually do, that you are 38 years old. You do have your high school equivalency, your GED. You have four children, and you -- a few moments ago tried to mention one of them. We will talk about that a little bit later. But first the nature of the crime, the single count indictment filed in September of 2010 charging you with knowingly recruiting and enticing and harboring and transporting any minor and with the use of force, fraud and coercion to engage in a commercial sex act. That was in violation of 18 U.S.C. section 1591.

In December of 2011 you were found guilty by a jury on that single count of the indictment and also by answers to questions that we gave to the jury. They found that you did use means of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion or in combination to cause what we refer to as S.W. at the time, we now call Shenae, to engage in a commercial sex act. That's set forth in the presentence report in paragraphs one and two. The conduct is further summarized in paragraphs 5 through 24. And I won't repeat

what's there other than to summarize a bit.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In January 2009 Shenae, who was a runaway and was living with a foster family in Holland, Ohio left home, ran away after having some problems adjusting to her foster parents residence. And in March of 2009 is when she was interviewed by the FBI case agent, and at that time she identified you from a photo array as the person with whom she had been for a period of time. And she provided the following information, she drifted for a while between the time she left home in January until she ended up with you, which was sometime around mid February of 2009. That's when she was introduced to you and moved in with you at your Durango Drive residence. You made her feel as though she was your girlfriend. She performed household chores and watched your eight year old daughter. She had intercourse with you almost daily, including anal intercourse and which she stated she did not want to do it but relented out of fear. You provided her with names and phone numbers of customers that were written in the journal. You coached her and directed her on what to charge and what to say. You provided her clothing, specifically under garments which she was to wear while engaging in acts of prostitution with clients. This is all what I'm summarizing, all that came out during the course of the trial. Although she never went outside the Toledo

area to engage in acts of prostitution at your direction you did have discussions about going to Detroit or to Florida, and you did go to Northwood, Ohio that one time for the swingers convention at a hotel there. Although nothing happened because you didn't want her giving it up for free when they should be paying for it. She was forced to walk Lagrange Street on at least one occasion in an effort to attract clients. You drove her there and you picked her up. And she also recounted being beaten by you on at least three occasions and was beaten upon the face, stomach, legs and hands. And at the time of her interview with the FBI case agent retained some faint bruising on her legs from a beating she said occurred several weeks prior.

How did she escape this hell? Well, she pretended she was sick to make you believe she needed medical attention. And you agreed to drop her off at her foster parents home on the night of March 19th, 2009. Prior to dropping her off, however, you threatened her and family if she contacted the police for questioning, causing her to continue to fear for her safety. You referenced a search warrant. Yes, this was a search warrant executed a week later at your Durango residence. And a number of the items that were recovered in that search were introduced and used at trial to confirm the story that Shenae testified to.

At the trial the government established your history as a pimp from the testimony of others, and Shenae testified that you were well aware of her age at the time, that she was 16 years old and that when she came to live with you, you provided her with food and clothing and housing, as it turns out all of which were in exchange for her becoming a prostitute. DNA evidence at the trial supported the testimony that Shenae gave and it's clear, it was clear to the jury, it's clear to me that you exercised a great deal of control over her and what she could or couldn't do, where she could go and where she couldn't, and that you caused her to believe that she was in fear for herself because of your conduct toward her. That is, again, a brief summary of what we heard at trial in this case.

So when I weigh the crime in this case, I don't think anyone can argue that it was a serious crime. I realize that you protest your guilty verdict and that you believe that you are innocent. That is a matter for another day and another court. I can tell you that other arguments you made today are consistent with arguments you have made in the past, the writings that you have provided to The Court. When you attack the jury and when you attack the witnesses, when you attack lawyers, both your own lawyer and the lawyers for the government, when you attack

the justice system, when you attack Shenae, you attack everyone, but you apparently don't look in the mirror, because if you were to look in the mirror, you would not see a very pretty picture.

You talk about gorilla justice. I'm going to, for the record, tell you that there was no gorilla justice in this case, nor was there in this courtroom. There was patience and justice, all in good time, all in good time. And what you got away with in this case and perhaps three years before has come to an end of the road.

I will indicate for the record I believe you have had effective assistance of counsel to the extent you allowed it in all the counsel that have represented you in this case. And again, some of the arguments that you made in your speech to me now, Mr. Willoughby, are not comments for an appropriate sentence but perhaps comments for an appeal because you clearly feel that you have not had a fair trial, a conclusion with which I strongly disagree.

Let's talk about the next factor, and that is your character an and background. And here, again, we can look to the presentence report. And by the way, the presentence report indicates in paragraphs 29 through 31 your version of events, some of which you've touched on here today. You have had a voice in that respect. I will tell you that I do not believe your version of events.

They are wholly unsupported by what I have seen and heard in this case. But I understand that that's how you feel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your character and background, we can start with your criminal history, which is summarized in the report in paragraphs 44 through 57. And your counsel has commented in his memorandum that, in essence, your criminal history isn't the worst of the worst, and I concede that, it is not. However, there is sufficient cases that you've had with the criminal justice system in the past. The most serious being the two prior drug offenses, and we've talked about that and written about that in this case so I won't repeat that here. I will note that you have managed, even with some of these serious offenses, to avoid long prison time. And one might argue that you have been given the benefit of opportunity to change your ways, but it's clear through the pattern of your criminal conduct and the consistency of your criminal conduct, be it serious or not so serious, that you have chosen a lifestyle of crime. And that is part of your character and background as confirmed in the report. One would also look to, if they chose, to your other criminal conduct, which is summarized in paragraph 61 through 71, and that might confirm the statement I just made. Let me also note that a number of these other crimes include warrants, probation violations, failure to appear or report, bench warrant, bench warrant,

bench warrant, again, capias issue, warrant issued. Let me comment just on the one. And that is the 2005 Michigan matter where you were convicted of delivery or manufacturer of narcotic, cocaine. That's where you went to a motel, and you sold crack cocaine to a confidential informant with your four year old daughter Gabrielle standing in the back seat of the vehicle witnessing the transaction. This is the conduct of a concerned father? I think not.

THE DEFENDANT: That was before I changed my ways, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Again, this presentence report covers a long period of time, and we'll go to personal and family data in paragraph 75 through 81 where you advised that your parents have been divorced for some years, mom employed at the University of Toledo in the administrative offices, your father retired from Toledo Picking and Steel (phonetic), both were remarried to others. You moved from your parents home at the age of 18, moved in with a girlfriend with whom you had at least one child, I think a couple children. You've had several children. The report does not indicate, and in fact in your own words, that you have a close relationship with any of these children.

Physical condition is summarized in paragraphs 82 through 84, nothing particularly significant there, other than you've lost some weight since being incarcerated which

may be a positive thing and which may have improved your high blood pressure and diabetes.

Mental and emotional health is summarized in paragraphs 85 through 89. Nothing particular of significance there. Substance abuse, paragraphs 90 through 93, again, some initial experimentation perhaps with marijuana or cocaine but nothing of significance there.

And as indicated earlier in paragraphs 94 and 95 got your GED and did begin to attend University of Toledo.

Employment record is paragraphed 97 through 102, and you've had some spotty employment as summarized in this report.

So character and background, I must tell you,
Mr. Willoughby, I unfortunately have to deal with a number
of criminal sentencings. It's not a pleasant experience.
It's probably the hardest part of my job, but I find very
little to grab ahold of in your report that says, ah ha,
here's something good about this guy. I struggle to find
in this presentence report or in anything I've heard during
the course of this case, something positive in your
character and background. I have defendants who come here
who are good people who do bad things. I have some
defendants who are bad people who do bad things. You fall
in that latter category.

Under the statute, there is a requirement that my

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

sentence reflect the seriousness of the crime, promote respect for the law and provide for a just punishment, deter you and others from crimes like this, protect the public from crimes like this and provide you with any needed training or treatment. And I'm also required to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities. And so let's talk about what works on those categories. This is a serious crime. I think a crime against a minor would be especially serious, and perhaps that is what motivated Congress in part and the sentencing commission to come up with the guidelines that they did in this case. If our society can do nothing else well, I hope we can protect the minors from whatever the crime against them might be. should protect the children but society, the parents the courts. Respect for the law is very important in a case like this involving a minor. Deterring crimes like this is important in a case like this involving minors. And protecting the public is important in a case like this.

I have reviewed the cases that Spiros provided and that the government provided with respect to other defendants and other cases. Let me say that it is difficult to find a common thread among these cases because sentences will vary depending upon whether there was a plea, whether there was cooperation, whether there was acceptance of responsibility, any remorse that might have

been shown, the different guideline ranges that might have applied in the various cases, the different statutes that apply in these cases, the different mandatory minimums that apply in these different cases. So when you look at the cases provided by both counsel as well as pretrial services, we see a range of sentences, some below the guideline range, some in the guideline range, some way above the guideline range. It depends. And in fact, in this case an individualized assessment, which is where I started my discussion, is important, and it's important to note the particulars of you, Mr. Willoughby in this case as well as the particular facts of this case. So I have taken into account all the cases cited by everyone to this court in arriving at a just sentence.

Spiros, you commented upon no victim statement, Yes, there wasn't one, however, I think, I believe and in my heart of hearts given what I observed in the courtroom, I have already heard the victim statement in this case. I indicated earlier her testimony was not shaken in any way, and frankly I believe she was quite courageous in both what she said and how she said it in this courtroom. And I believe also that with respect to the guideline range, yes, you and I and others in this courtroom could have quite a discussion, I suppose, about different penalties that congress gives us and the defendant guidelines for

different kinds of crime. But in this case, the guidelines given to me reflect, I believe in part, that we're dealing with live victims here, unlike pornography cases where we oftentimes have defendants who are merely huddled in a dark room with a computer all by themselves and viewing pictures with no acting out, so to speak. Here we have a live victim who suffered at the hands of this defendant over a period of time.

And so I am presented with a presumptive reasonable guideline range. And my decision today is in part can I find something in this record that would suggest to me that a downward variance as you've requested is appropriate. You talked about a crime of violence, and I believe I've addressed that in my papers that I filed, but I would also note that in the summary I gave earlier. And if you don't find violence in this case given the testimony, I don't know where you would find it. And as I indicated in my filings when The Sixth Circuit tells me that pepper spray constitutes a crime of violence, how can we not say what occurred here constituted a crime of violence.

So in summary, we have a violent felony here, we have a defendant, Mr. Willoughby, with two prior convictions involving drugs, we have a situation where a young runaway, vulnerable, ends up with you and suffers at

your hands for a period of time, cleaning your house, watching your daughter and then you having sexual intercourse with her almost daily and then turning her out to turn tricks for you for money and keeping her captive, if you will, for a month or so. I note for the record that as you began to talk about your son, certainly at the time of the presentence report, you had no ongoing relationship with your son who I believe is now 16 years old. Your youngest daughter Gabrielle, age 11, who lived with you at the time of this, I am shuttered to think of what an example you were setting for these children with your lifestyle.

You tell me today repeatedly you should not be sentenced. I disagree. You should be sentenced and you will be sentenced as part of the process here. And the difficult part is determining what is an appropriate sentence under the guidelines and under the statute.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of this court that you be sentenced and committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 360 months. That is the lowest end of the guideline range and I believe it is appropriate in this case. You will be also committed to supervised release upon your release from prison, and that supervised release will be for a term of five years. I am going to waive a

fine in this case finding you don't have the ability to pay a fine. I'm going to order the special assessment of \$100 due and payable immediately. There are certain standard conditions of your supervised release. Have you reviewed that with your client, Spiros?

MR. COCOVES: Judge, we got that towards the end -- or I guess towards the beginning, and no, we did not.

THE COURT: Do you want to review it now, or do you want me to recite it into the record?

MR. COCOVES: Might be appropriate to recite it into the record.

THE COURT: Then I will. That document will indicate that part of those conditions of supervised release include mandatory drug testing, also includes sex offender registration and notification, also known as the Adam Walsh Act, also include minor protection and restriction program, the MPRP, also include a restriction on firearms and dangerous weapons, also require conditions for search and seizure and conditions for financial disclosure, and also require you to cooperate in the collection of DNA. Those are all terms under your supervised release. And before you leave the courtroom today I'm going to ask that you review that document with your lawyer, and you'll have the opportunity then to have

that document filed and made part of the record in this case.

There's been an indication that you wish to be referred to Milan for the service of your sentence. I will recommend Milan. I can't order it. That's a determination made by the Bureau of Prisons, and they'll have to make that final decision, but we will include in our paperwork that you wish to reside in Milan or a facility close to Toledo.

Counsel for either side know of any reason not previously made why this sentence I have just outlined should no be imposed?

MR. MARONEY: We do not, Your Honor.

MR. COCOVES: Just one moment, Judge.

(Defendant and counsel having an off the record discussion.)

MR. COCOVES: No, Judge, I think The Court has before it multiple of objections which The Court has ruled on. I just have one point. There was a sentencing -- there was a hearing held on December 6th of 2011. The transcript of that was placed under seal. I'd like leave just to provide a copy to Mr. Willoughby of that with the hearing still -- with the transcript still under seal.

THE COURT: Why don't we couple that with the earlier request of Mr. Willoughby. Are we talking about a

```
different transcript now or the same transcript?
 1
 2
               MR. COCOVES: The transcript of December 6th,
 3
     2011. That was prior to the trial. It involved the
 4
     request of Mr. Willoughby to have Mr. Hartman released as
 5
     trial counsel.
 6
               THE COURT: So we have two requests that have
 7
    been made at the hearing today, one of a document under
     seal that took place prior to trial and one is a document
 8
 9
     under seal that took place during trial. I'm going to ask
10
     you to put those in writing to give the government an
11
     opportunity to respond to each of those requests and then
     I'll issue a ruling accordingly on those.
12
13
               MR. COCOVES:
                             I will.
14
               THE COURT: Anything further, Spiros, from you?
15
               MR. COCOVES: No, sir.
16
               THE COURT: Have I addressed all of your
17
     arguments, Spiros?
18
               MR. COCOVES: I believe so, yes.
19
               THE COURT: You wish to say something,
20
     Mr. Willoughby?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. Besides the
22
     December 6th hearing, I just want to place the reason that
23
     I want the transcript for that on the record is because if
24
     I choose to move for an IOC on direct examination, I need
25
     that transcript to make that decision of the
```

December 6th hearing. I also request the April 10th counsel substitution hearing as well for the same purpose because I may decide to do an IOC on direct appeal.

THE COURT: And your lawyer just indicated I think that he was referring to both of those, and as I indicated a formal request from your lawyer on the record, to allow government an opportunity to respond and I will then rule accordingly.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I would also like to have the Butler County Children's Services records unsealed and provided to me for the same purpose, for appellate purpose, to see if there was any Brady material, Jencks material or anything that I was not made aware of being that I just found out that that was --

THE COURT: If those are a part of the record in this case under seal your lawyer can make that part of the motion. If they're not within The Court's possession, that's a different story. There's another avenue for you, I suppose. But I'll leave it to counsel to have a conversation. And what I would ask is that defense counsel file one motion indicating all that is requested allowing the government to respond to each of those. And then I will have a hearing if necessary, but certainly will rule on that as promptly as I can.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. So that -- there was --

there was several more but you're saying should I put those on the record?

THE COURT: If you want to, but I think your lawyer's going to need to put them in a formal filing so the government has a chance to respond to it unless, Spiros, you want to just allow this recitation today to be your formal filing?

MR. COCOVES: I think coming from Mr. Willoughby that would be the best.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll continue, and I'll ask the government to probably order at least a portion of this transcript so they understand what they need to respond to. Go ahead. I have three items so far that you've documented.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. I'm also requesting the FD-302s or any -- or any memorandum, interview or photos that dealt with Ms. Renee Todd that I was never provided with when she testified. I was never provided with those materials. I'm requesting those materials. I'm requesting the same materials for Mary Wise, I was never provided. I'm requesting the same material for Albert Tusin, which I was never -- I was never given those FD-302s or any memoranda or anything, what he was going to say. I'm also requesting these photos of these alleged bruises that I was never given and any and all medical examinations from

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

January 19th through June 17th of 2009 to determine if there was any Brady material or Jencks material, you know, the furtherance of my rights of confrontation in dealing with those -- the evaluations with Shenae Wells herself for the continuous duty of discovery for my appeals.

THE COURT: And I'll allow the government to respond to those requests and I'll rule. As you've noted, those are matters that may be more appropriate for another proceeding in another court as opposed to the reason why we're gathered here today. I need to indicate for the record, Mr. Willoughby, that you may exercise any rights to appeal that you have or believe you have within 14 days of the entry of my judgment, and that entry will take place later this week, I suspect. Please consult with your counsel who will remain your counsel until any notice of appeal is filed. And if you believe you have a right for appeal and grounds for appeal to exist, please have your counsel timely file notice right to appeal, otherwise you will lose forever whatever rights you might have to challenge either your conviction or sentence by either a direct or indirect appeal. And if you need assistance in filing notice of appeal for some reason, the clerk of courts can assist you. You certainly have competent counsel who can assist you in that regard.

With that, let me close with this, and that is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Willoughby, as I indicated earlier, I disagree with a number of the comments that you made here today. I don't believe you've been publicly beaten. Again, you seem to want to turn the tables. It was Shenae who was beaten both physically and emotionally. And you compare yourself to Rodney King, really? Really?

THE DEFENDANT: In the courtroom.

THE COURT: You attack everyone, try to blame race, you try to blame everyone but you don't look in the mirror apparently. You don't see what everyone around you sees. And I certainly looked for and struggled to find and could not find a reason why I should vary downward as has been suggested by you and your counsel. And I could not find a reason to vary downward. There is very little in this record of your life to date that would cause you to place that document or that story in front of someone and say, look, aren't you proud of what I did or who I helped or what good I've done? It is a sorry story that I see in front of me, and I would note in closing that your nickname, P.T., Party Time, party time is over, Mr. Willoughby. It is prison time, a long time but a deserved time. Anything further from counsel for either side?

MR. MARONEY: Your Honor, you'll allow us to respond then to the various requests that have been made?

THE COURT: Correct. The oral requests here 1 2 today, I would ask that you respond to that within a week 3 if you can, please. And I will either have a hearing, if 4 appropriate, or rule with a prompt order on 5 Mr. Willoughby's request. 6 MR. MARONEY: Thank you. 7 MR. COCOVES: Yes, just briefly, Judge Mr. Willoughby will be seeking new counsel for his appeal. 8 I -- as I understand based on my experience with The Sixth 9 Circuit, I will be on counsel to file notice of appeal. 10 will then be assigned a case number for Mr. Willoughby. At 11 that time I will file a motion to withdraw. And I think 12 13 that that will -- those are typically granted. 14 THE COURT: Yes. 15 MR. COCOVES: And Mr. Willoughby will be given 16 assigned counsel by The Sixth Circuit. 17 THE COURT: That's correct. 18 MR. COCOVES: But it is my full intention to file 19 a notice of appeal, and once the judgment and commitment 20 order has been filed with The Court, I'll probably do it 21 that same day. 22 THE COURT: Very good. Then I will certainly, 23 what I may well do then is hold off until I file that final 24 judgment until I receive your response to your oral request 25 today so we can make that all part of the same package and

```
rule accordingly. So the order may not follow for a few
 1
 2
     days yet. The sooner you get your response in, the sooner
 3
     I'll rule and the sooner we can move this case down I-75.
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: So Your Honor, so does my clock
 5
     start -- when does that start?
 6
               THE COURT: Your lawyer will know. It's when the
 7
     entry of today's sentencing is filed and docketed with the
 8
     clerk.
 9
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Okay.
10
               THE COURT: It doesn't start today, and it won't
11
     start given what we've just discussed until sometime
12
     perhaps at the earliest next week. But your lawyer will be
13
     on top of that and will advise you I'm sure.
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Okay. And I will get appellate
     specialist from The Sixth Circuit?
15
16
               THE COURT: Upon the appropriate motion, yes, you
17
     will have assigned counsel for your appeal, different
18
     counsel.
              That's standard course.
19
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               Thank you.
20
               THE COURT: We are adjourned.
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
4	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
5	
6	s:/Angela D. Nixon
7	
8	Angela D. Nixon, RPR, CRR Date
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	